DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 449 VT 015 007

AUTHOR	Tracy, Robert G.; And Others
TITLE	A Study of the Relationship between Military Service in the Armed Forces and Criminality. Criminal Justice Monograph Vol. III, No. 1.
INSTITUTION	Sam Houston State Univ., Huntsville, Tex. Inst. of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences.
SPONS AGENCY	Criminal Justice Council of Texas.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	93p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute of Contemporary Corrections, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas 77340
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Aggression; Comparative Analysis; Correctional Rehabilitation; *Corrective Institutions; *Crime; Criminology; *Military Service; Prisoners; Social Factors; Social Psychology; *Veterans; *Violence

ABSTRACT

To determine the effects of military service on subsequent criminal behavior, especially violent crimes, this study compared veteran and non-veteran felons incarcerated at the Texas Department of Corrections. Available programed data on inmates born since 1930 were supplemented by interview and questionnaire data on 200 veterans concerning military experience and offense committed. Although statistically significant differences were discovered in social, criminal history, and institutional characteristics of veteran and non-veteran felons, no important differences were found in the types of crime committed. The hypothesized relationship between military service and specific criminality was rejected. Further research was recommended to evaluate the potential of specialized rehabilitation for the ex-serviceman felon. (BH)

ED 061 449

CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH

Vol. III, No. 1
1971

A Study of the Relationship Between Military Service in the Armed Forces and Criminality

Robert G. Tracy
Charles M. Friel
Hazel B. Kerper
George G. Killinger

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Huntsville, Texas

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS 77340

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Institute of Contemporary Corrections & the Behavioral Sciences Sam Houston State University
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

GEORGE G. KILLINGER, Ph.D., *Chairman*

HAZEL B. KERPER, J.D.
CHARLES M. FRIEL, Ph.D.
DOROTHY D. HAYES, Ph.D.
JAMES J. ALLMAN, M.A.
JAMES D. MCLEOD, M.A.
DONALD J. WEISENHORN, M.S.W.
JEANNE P. YOUNG, M.S.W.
JOHN C. WATKINS, J.D.

ADMINISTRATION OF MONOGRAPH

GEORGE G. KILLINGER,
Director of Institute

CHARLES M. FRIEL, *Director*
Monograph Series

This MONOGRAPH was prepared for use in the Center for Continuing Education in Criminal Justice under grant from the Criminal Justice Council of Texas.

Copyright © 1970
By
Institute of Contemporary Corrections and The Behavioral Sciences
Sam Houston State University

The CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH is designed to [illegible] field with a series of articles on the problems of crime and [illegible] papers on problems in law enforcement, [illegible] welfare. The MONOGRAPH is not restricted to any particular philosophy [illegible] but encourages an eclectic discussion of all problems pertinent to the criminal [illegible]

Permission to quote excerpts is granted on condition that appropriate credit is given [illegible]. Requests for permission to reprint [illegible] Institute.

Entered as Second-Class Mail Matter, August 24, 1912, at [illegible] Huntsville.

ED 061 449

CRIMINAL JUSTICE
MONOGRAPH

Vol. III, No. 1

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MILITARY SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES AND CRIMINALITY

Robert G. Tracy
Charles M. Friel
Hazel B. Kerper
George G. Killinger

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Huntsville, Texas 77340

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY.................................. 1

Statement of the Problem............................ 1

Purpose of the Study................................ 7

Review of the Literature............................ 9

II. METHODOLOGY.. 29

General... 29

Procedures.. 35

III. STATISTICAL FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.................... 40

General... 40

Results of Chi Square............................... 40

Results of t-Test................................... 43

Discussion of Significant Variables................. 43

Responses to Questionnaire Items.................... 56

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS................................. 60

Review of the Study................................. 60

Findings.. 61

Recommendations..................................... 62

BIBLIOGRAPHY.. 64

APPENDIX A. Frequency Distribution Tables.................. 69

APPENDIX B. Sample Questionnaire........................... 89

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

Introduction

Throughout history man has gone to war. To prepare these men for the mental and physical rigors of combat and to ensure absolute discipline at times of intense crises, it has been necessary to provide specialized training and develop attitudes that are unique to the armed forces. In an effort to infuse a sense of urgency and solidarity, military leaders seek to invoke a combat oriented philosophy and maintain an aggressive posture.[1] These actions have been necessary in that the success of group discipline within the military has, for better or worse, been linked to the development of applied personal psychology. As surely as men go to war, many will return to their communities as civilians. It is therefore important that consideration be given the possible relationship between service in the armed forces and its influence on the subsequent behavior of ex-servicemen in civilian pursuits.

From a sociological perspective, an individual is continually involved in social interactions with groups and other individuals which influence his attitudes, his orientation toward life's experiences, and even his conception of himself. It has been argued that military service may render some individuals more susceptible to a criminalistic orientation.[1] This concept has been expanded to a contention that the armed forces takes peaceloving, nonaggressive individuals from their homes and communities and teaches them to kill, to be aggressive and to hate.

---

[1] Morris Janowitz, The Professional Soldier (Michigan: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960), 44.

The commission of a sensational crime by an ex-serviceman, usually a crime which is characterized by unusual brutality, peculiar behavior or bizarre circumstances, is regarded as prima facie evidence of "What the military has made out of the individual." Often, when newspapers report a crime committed by an ex-serviceman, his military record appears in the account in such a manner as to intimate that his military service had something to do with the offense.

Willard Waller, writing in The Veteran Comes Back, commented:

> Sometimes the veteran has been so completely alienated from the attitudes and controls of civilian life that he becomes a criminal. Why this should be so is almost too obvious to need statement. The soldier must kill, must make a study of the art of killing, and overcome all his inbred repugnance to the taking of life. Perhaps he comes to enjoy killing. Military experience also weakens the taboos which protect property and hedge about sexual indulgence....For these reasons and others such as mental shock, lack of a trade, etc., many veterans become criminals.[2]

---

[1] Michael Hakeem, "Service in the Armed Forces and Criminality", Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Vol. 37, No. 2 (July-August, 1946), 120-137.

[2] Willard Waller, The Veteran Comes Back, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Comp., Inc., 1944), 197.

The most frequent application of the notion that military service may make a person criminalistic has been made in analyses of case histories. Speculation, however, invariably enters the analysis when an attempt is made to show in a particular case record that it was the subject's military training that led him to resort to the fireing of a weapon in the crisis of a tavern brawl. The tendency in the case study method has been to select any outstanding factors in the case and to designate them as the important factors in crime causation.[1] If military training is designed to encourage physical aggression and promote skill in the use of weapons, it would not necessarily be an illogical assumption that an individual with such training would exercise these traits in times of frustration and crises.

Sensational crimes and sudden, impulsive murders, however, are being committed every day by persons with no military training or experiences. It is generally accepted by criminologists that most individuals, under specific conditions and situations, are capable of some transgression of the law.[2]

It is not possible to explain adequately why one person commits a specific crime while another, with similar traits, experiences and social situation does not. Despite the expanding scope of criminological knowledge, it is foolhardy to say just what are the causes of crime. Many scholars have insisted that crime is a product of a large number and great variety of factors and that these factors cannot now or perhaps ever be organized into general propositions which have no exceptions.[1] This study does not attempt to establish or reject military service as a causative factor in criminality. Such an endeavor would only be an exercise in speculation.

---

[1] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 122.

[2] Gresham M. Sykes and Thomas E. Drabek, Law and the Lawless (New York: Random House, 1969), 179.

Need for Research

There are currently over three million Americans engaged in some aspect of military service. A very large percentage of these individuals have been inducted into the military service as a result of Federal draft legislation. As the term itself implies, men who were drafted did not voluntarily choose to serve and not infrequently demonstrate a negative attitude toward military discipline.

Since the ultimate mission of any armed forces branch is to engage an enemy in combat or to support such a mission, all persons entering the armed forces receive some degree of basic combat training. Unless an individual who has been drafted elects to voluntarily re-enlist, he is released from active duty within two years and becomes a service veteran. A simple exercise in mathematics would disclose that a large number of the three million men currently serving in the armed forces are continually returning to civilian endeavors. Do these ex-servicemen retain a certain "aggressive drive" and transfer it to civilian life?[1]

---

[1] Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, Principals of Criminology (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1966), 61.

An incident that occured during March, 1968, in the village of My Lai, Republic of South Vietnam, was concerned with the alleged massacre of over one hundred Vietnamese civilians by American infantrymen.[2] Certain of the servicemen were charged with murder and subsequently indicted and tried in accordance with the Uniform Code of Military Justice. It was the responsibility of the military Courts Martial to determine whether the infantrymen were individually guilty. The significant thing about the incident was that it was not perpetrated by demented men. Investigation has indicated that they were apparently normal individuals, some only recently inducted into the military service, who would regard it unthinkable to strike a child, much less kill one. Yet, these soldiers in American uniforms were charged with a barbaric atrocity.

The point to be made in relating the foregoing incident is that these men had been conditioned to execute certain lawful military orders and had been trained in the skillful use of combat weaponry. At a time of crisis these soldiers had reacted in a manner which cannot be explained here. It has been proposed that the ex-serviceman would be particularly prone to exercise methods of aggressive self-assertation and self-protection in times of frustration and crisis.[1] Perry V. Wagley, in an article concerned with crime by veterans states:

---

[1] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 125.

[2] Marsh Clark, "My Lai: An American Tragedy", Time Magazine, Vol. 94, No. 23 (December 5, 1969), 24-32.

> The aggressive, primitive urges expressed in hate, violence, destruction, and the need to kill have been encouraged in the fighting soldier throughout the period of his conditioning, combat training and fighting. All of these attitudes and conduct will have to be reshaped and controlled....Failure to achieve this end will result in unrestrained patterns of belligerency, hate, violence, corruption and plunder.[2]

To retain the proper perspective of the ex-service offender, it is necessary that his experiences prior to induction and service-related activities be considered. There are a number of young soldiers who simply find difficulty in adjusting themselves to the conditions of military service. Through thoughtlessness and lack of a sense of discipline, these young men commit offenses which cause them to become a nuisance to their units. A great number of such military offenders have been found to have deep-seated problems which would likely have brought them into conflict with any form of authority, military or civilian.[1]

---

[1] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 121.

[2] Perry V. Wagley, "Some Criminologic Implications of the Returning Soldier", Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Vol. 34, No. 2 (January-February, 1944), 313-314.

Problems with recruits who were civilian delinquents has led the Department of Defense to become interested in methods of weeding out before induction, those potential recruits who lack emotional maturity and stability. In 1963 a descriptive study was made of 271 military offenders in an army stockade who had a history of being school dropouts.[2] A similarity was drawn between the unsatisfactory school experience and the failure to perform adequately within the military situation. There seemed to be a strong trend toward behavior which tended to strengthen the class identity of the subjects through faulty work experience and continued delinquent behavior. Significant research which may assist in the identification of these individuals can be important in minimizing the waste of investment in training and reducing problems of discipline.

Purpose of the Study

The men currently serving in the armed forces represent a significantly important social group within modern American society. Although legislation has been periodically proposed that would make military service entirely voluntary, the nature of present draft laws are designed to ensure an ffective national defense force and continue to obligate a ast number of citizens to military service.

---

[1] Joseph Trenaman, Out of Step (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952), 30.

[2] Brand Shellhause, "A Descriptive Study of the Uneducated AWOL Offender", Crime and Delinquency Abstracts, Vol. 5, No. 4, (1963), 315.

The purpose of this study is to make an evaluative omparison of veteran and non-veteran felons incarcerated in he Texas Department of Corrections and to consider the influence of military service on subsequent criminal behavior. ue to the fact that the United States has been engaged in ncreasingly bitter combat in the Republic of South Vietnam or a period in excess of eight years, particular attention s to be given an evaluation of aggressive/violent crimes committed by veteran and non-veteran offenders.

An analysis will be made of any statistically significant differences to determine if such factors could be identified prior to induction into the armed forces. Significant differences which may be revealed in veterans consequent to military training, particularly in regard to the nature of offenses, would indicate further consideration of discharge procedures by the Department of Defense.

Annually, there are over five thousand soldiers who are punitively discharged from the armed forces. These individuals have committed offenses, military and civilian, which necessitated their expulsion from the service and frequently require incarceration in a federal or military prison. Still another large group of servicemen are administratively discharged as unfit or unsuited for military duty and responsibility. It would not be erroneous to assume that a number of these individuals will continue their deviant conduct in the civilian community. In the event military service and training contributes to anti-social behavior, discharge from the armed forces without responsible rehabilitative efforts is certainly not in the best interests of the nation.

The results of this study will provide a descriptive profile of the service veteran inmate and permit a qualified evaluation of the contention that military service may give individuals a criminalistic orientation.[1] In consideration of the time and money involved in the training of men for military service, it is important that their selection for induction be guided by all available standards and the enlistment of unsuitable men avoided. More importantly, any adverse influence military service may have on certain criminal behavior after discharge deserves the attention of further research and study in behalf of the incarcerated veteran.

Review of the Literature

Authoritative studies concerned with the military service veteran as a felon are somewhat limited in quantity but singularly impressive in quality. An interesting revelation in the review of publications and reports dealing with these individuals is the presence of contradictions concerning the influence of military service in portions of the research results. The apparent contradictions are worthy of examination in that the selected studies have been exhaustive, comprehensive and involve some of the most respected criminologists in the field.

---

[1] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 121.

The diversity of approaches to research involving ex-service offenders complicates efforts to make a unilateral comparison of the various studies. For example, the case history approach used by a number of research authors, has frequently supported the premise that military service and subsequent criminality are related.[1] The essential problems connected with this particular approach include the difficulties in obtaining a significant sample of subjects and the tendency to interject unwarranted speculation into the analysis of a particular case record.[2] Other studies approach the dichotomy in an attempt to isolate single causative factors with scanty statistical comparisons of veteran and non-veteran felons. The scope of these studies are subsequently limited but serve a meaningful purpose in rejecting certain false assumptions.

A third, and more readily comparable approach to the study of crime by ex-servicemen, seeks to evaluate all available factors common to the study sample. An analysis of this type permits the comparison of significant differences and provides a perspective evaluation of the other factors at the same time. One of the most complete studies ever conducted on the effects of the military service and its experiences is a monumental four volume effort by Samuel Stouffer and colleagues, The American Soldier, published in 1949.[1] This research is a classic in its comprehensiveness and contains data collected from a world-wide sample of 4000 officers and 23,000 enlisted men of the U. S. armed forces.

---

[1] Willard Waller..., op. cit., 199.

[2] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 122.

It is almost impossible to indicate from statistical evidence the increase of crime perpetrated by selected groups over a definite period of time. This is partially due to the absence of sufficient accurate statistics to make reliable comparisons of the extent of crime at different periods. The difficulties become more pronounced because of changes from time to time in the definition of certain crimes and new crimes are constantly being set down in law books in consequence to modern methods of living.[2]

Still another consideration is that particular forms of conduct receive less statutory attention than others. Hermann Mannheim noted these problems in the preface to his book, Social Aspects of Crime in England Between the Wars, published in 1940.[3] Basically a critical interpretation of

---

[1] Samuel Stouffer and others, The American Soldier, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949), Vol. 2.

[2] Harry Best, Crime and the Criminal Law in the United States (New York: The McMillian Company, 1930), 134-137.

[3] Hermann Mannheim, Social Aspects of Crime in England Between the Wars (London: George Allen and Urwin LTD, 1940).

English Criminal Statistics and a survey of the principal criminological features of the period after World War I, Mannheim realized the difficulties of predictive comments based on his research due to the outbreak of World War II. Mannheim lamented:

> A host of new and more or less unforeseen problems has already arisen, others will probably arise in the course of the next few years, and it may become necessary to revise old conceptions and to make a fresh start.[1]

Despite this firm admonishment by Mannheim, authors and researchers through the years have cited portions of his studies dealing with war veterans in their approaches to the influence of military service on criminality. Perry Wagley was especially concerned with those individuals he termed "socially, mentally, emotionally and physically handicapped soldiers" who he believed would not be able to adapt themselves to civilian life after the disorganizing and disintergrating experience which they encountered in the many phases of military activity.[2] Wagley was convinced that some of them would inevitably come into conflict with the law.

Mannheim supported the premise that some of the ex-servicemen came home after World War I with "the soldier's attitude to life, which is fundamentally, in spite of discipline, a lawless attitude."[1] He cited English statistics to show that in 1920, of 6,461 ex-soldiers committed to prison, 3,411 or fifty-three percent, were first offenders.[2] Mannheim considered these preliminary statistics to be evidence of the ex-soldier's apparent inability to conform readily to the conditions of civilian life. In further substantiation of this hypothesis, the English annual crime Report-1920 stated in part:

---

[1] Ibid., 26.

[2] Perry V. Wagley..., op. cit., 311.

> A large proportion were young men, some earning good wages at the time of their committal, and they were not prompted to commit crime because of want, but through sheer lawlessness, which may not have been due to criminal instincts, but generated by the conditions of active service in different parts of the world, where the normal restraints of conduct had been banished by the stress of war.[3]

As previously suggested, contradictory statistics are not difficult to accumulate. Further, it is not wise to compare international statistics due to some fundamental variances in data collection, juvenile offense standards and cultural differences in definition of statutory law. Meticulous research into the nature of offenses committed by ex-soldiers led Mannheim to propose that the atmosphere of military service causes a general diminution of the individual's respect for property of the state. Although he would not unconditionally attribute it to military service or other singular factors, Mannheim consolidated English Criminal Statistics to illustrate a marked increase in offenses against property immediately after World War I. Grouping specific offenses against property, to facilitate effective comparison, he was able to demonstrate an increase in offense rates from 99,513 in 1920 to 269,046 in 1938.[1]

---

[1] Hermann Mannheim..., op. cit., 108.

[2] Ibid., 110, quoted from Report-1920, 6.

[3] Ibid., 112, quoted from Report-1920, 10.

Recent studies have tended to refute the contention that military service is a significant consideration in criminality by veterans. In 1954, John Spencer published the first detailed empirical analysis of military service and its specific relationship to crime.[2] In this research, the criminal was studied against the background of civilian life as well as within the military service. The important finding of Spencer's study was that he provided valid statistical evidence in rebuttal of the view that ex-servicemen were responsible for the increase of crime in England after World War I. Spencer's comprehensive argument centered around the suggestion that these individuals would have been inclined toward criminality regardless of military service.

Michael Hakeem had reached a similar conclusion in his study of 510 subjects committed to a state penitentiary during a two year period ending June 30, 1945.[3] The most crucial data for the purposes of the study was the information concerning the past criminality of the ex-servicemen prior to induction into the armed forces and the nature of the crime which led to their conviction. In this regard, it was found that sixty-one per cent of the non-veterans had some previous criminal record but sixty-eight per cent of the ex-servicemen had also been in conflict with the law.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., 107, Table X.

[2] John C. Spencer, _Crime and the Services_ (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul LTD, 1954).

[3] Michael Hakeem..., _op_. _cit_., 124.

To weigh the contention that military training would increase aggressive, assaultive crimes against persons, Hakeem compared the two groups and found only a slight edge in favor of the veteran. In comparisons covering a wide range of factors, Hakeem found no significant differences between the groups and concluded that the ex-servicemen who were committed to the penitentiary would have found their way there even if they had not been inducted into the armed forces. Sutherland concurs in the argument against violent crimes as a consequence to military training. He observed that when former servicemen were committed to federal prison after World War I they were most likely, in comparison with those who had not seen war service, to be committed for fraud, embezzlement and non-support, and least likely to be imprisoned for homicide, assault and rape.[2]

Finally, Walter A. Lunden, a former U. S. Army prison officer, made an extensive study of 16,895 inmates in eight

---

[1] Ibid., 128.

[2] Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey..., op. cit., 257.

Mid-Western states during 1947-1949. Of the original sample, 5,599 (33.2%) were identified as former servicemen.[1] In a negative approach, he asked that if military duty is to be considered an important factor in criminality, how can it be explained that two-thirds of the men had never served the nation and yet had committed a crime serious enough to bring them to the same institution. Lunden conceded it was possible that in ten per cent of the cases, military experience may have had some connection with later civilian crimes. However, he concluded that it cannot be said with any degree of certainty that military service causes men to commit crimes. Lunden summarized his study with six points of emphasis:

1. The age of the offender is more important than military experience in accounting for his crime.
2. More than two-thirds of the inmates had no military record.
3. Almost three-fourths of the ex-servicemen had a police record prior to entering the armed forces.
4. Approximately one-third of the ex-servicemen had serious trouble while in the armed forces.
5. Conditions at home after return from duty often played an important part in their conduct.
6. Two-thirds of the men themselves indicated that their military experience was not related to the crime for which they were incarcerated.[2]

The scope of the important studies dealing with the criminogenic influences of military service vary considerably. As might be expected, the numerical range of selected variables differed in accordance with availability of records, limitations of time and the design of the study. To facilitate a brief profile of pertinent considerations and conclusions, those differentiating factors which consistently emerged as significant, or uniquely insignificant, have been extracted from the various studies. The factors most frequently associated with analyses of criminality in the ex-serviceman include, (1) Race, (2) Age, (3) Marital Status, (4) Previous record of delinquency/crime, (5) Educational Achievement, (6) Economic Status, (7) Adjustment to Military Service, and, (8) Nature of Civilian Offense Committed.

---

[1] Walter A. Lunden, "Military Service and Criminality", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 42, No. 6 (March-April, 1952), 766-773.

[2] *Ibid.*, 773.

Race

In Hakeem's statistical comparison of 510 veteran and non-veteran felons, race was the sole factor he reported as showing a significant difference between the two groups. For reasons not determined in the study, a smaller proportion of Negroes than would be expected was found among the ex-servicemen.[1] Negroes are responsible for a disproportionate amount of criminal behavior. For the year 1960, total arrests included in the Uniform Crime Reports revealed nearly thirty per cent were Negroes while they comprise only about ten to eleven per cent of the total population.[2]

---

[1] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 130.

[2] Prepared by the FBI on the basis of data voluntarily submitted by law enforcement agencies.

Care must be taken in interpreting criminal statistics in regard to race since they are based on the popular conception of race rather than an anthropological differentiation. If a person were defined as "Negro" only when his ancestry was at least half Negro, a large proportion of "Negro" crime would be transferred to other racial categories.[1] It is generally agreed that comparison of crime rates between races must take into account the differences in economic, educational and other characteristic influencing exposure to risk of criminality.

Age

Many varieties of statistics, collected by many types of agencies, uniformly report a high incidence of crime among young persons.[2] In Lunden's study of 5,599 inmates with military experience, he found no significant age difference in a comparison with non-veterans and proposed that:

> Crime, in the main, especially property crimes, are committed by young men....These same men, because they were young men, would most likely have committed crimes had they never been in the military.[3]

The U. S. Uniform Crime Reports show that ages from 15 to 25 have the highest arrest rates.[4] A comparison of the subjects in Hakeem's study revealed the modal age of the ex-servicemen to be 21.7 years. The non-service inmate was reported as 19.8 years of age.[1] Divergent conclusions can be drawn from considerations of age in criminality. Stouffer's report in The American Soldier provided valuable insight into the influence of military experiences on the young adult. A confidential questionnaire, completed by recently discharged veterans, disclosed that the younger men were more likely than the older men to report learning "bad habits" in the army by a sixty-three to thirty-seven per cent ratio.[2]

---

[1] Elmer H. Johnson, Crime, Correction, and Society (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1968), 77.

[2] Edwin Sutherland and Donald Cressey..., op. cit., 77.

[3] Walter A. Lunden..., op. cit., 767.

[4] See the current issue of Uniform Crime Reports.

Marital Status

The marital status of the adult person appears to have considerable significance in relation to crime. The rate of commitment to prisons and reformatories per 100,000 population of the same marital status is lowest for the married, next to lowest for the widowed, next for the single and highest for the divorced.[3] On the other hand, care must be taken in interpreting official statistics regarding marital status. Datum concerned with this factor may be misleading unless distinctions are made according to age groups. The most criminal age group among adult males, i.e. those of 17 to 25, include a larger proportion of single individuals. A conclusion may be drawn that single males are throughout more criminal than married ones, whereas the figures may merely prove that there are age differences in criminal inclinations which may have but little to do with marriage.

---

[1] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 125.

[2] Samuel A. Stouffer and Others..., op. cit., 593.

[3] Hermann Mannheim, Comparative Criminology (London: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), 626.

To achieve a reliable evaluation of marital status as a factor in criminality, one would have to compare samples of married men and unmarried men matched not only for age but also for social and economic class. One of the difficulties in obtaining reliable information of this kind is that many offenders are inclined to distort the facts concerning their marital status. Inmates will state they are married when they are only co-habiting and often supress information on separations or illegitimacy.[1]

Previous Record of Delinquency/Crime

One of the most consistently recurring factors revealed in inquiries of ex-service offenders was their predisposition toward conflict with the law prior to induction into the armed forces. Joseph Trenaman's study of young military offenders in the British army found them difficult to reform and a bad influence on other soldiers. After extensive case history research he concluded:

> It was therefore believed that these were normal delinquent types. One-third of them were already manifestly delinquent, and the other two-thirds must have come from that vast fringe of potential delinquents who might well have been brought before the courts had the arm of the law been longer or more active.[2]

---

[1] Elmer H. Johnson..., op. cit., 86.

[2] Joseph Trenaman..., op. cit., 30.

The results of Walter Lunden's data on ex-service felons in the Mid-West showed that seventy per cent of them had been in conflict with the law prior to entering the military. Finally a demographic study in 1963 was made of 33 convicted felons who had enlisted in the army by waiver. Each subject had subsequently become a military offender and was confined in an army stockade. It was found that, without exception, the offense committed by each subject was of a less grave nature than the offense for which he had been convicted in civilian life. To this extent, each subject demonstrated some reduction of his delinquent behavior, but gave no evidence of total abandonment of such behavior.[1]

Educational Achievement

As evidenced in truancy, revolt against school itself can be the first step toward crime. In summarizing a number of studies, E. H. Johnson lists three conclusions concerned with the relationship between educational achievement and delinquency:

> 1. Among delinquents, there was found a high percentage of juveniles with poor school adjustment.
> 2. A relatively high percentage of delinquents verbalized a dislike for school in general.
> 3. There appears to be a high correlation between truancy and repeated delinquency.[2]

---

[1] Brand Shellhause..., op. cit., #1315.

[2] Elmer H. Johnson..., op. cit., 93.

Education, as a process, continues into adulthood and influences, positively or negatively, the whole life of an individual. The complexities of the short and long term aspects of formal education and crime causation prohibit detailed analysis for the purposes of this study. None of the selected studies found schooling to be of particular significance. Hakeem compared the intelligence quotients of 510 veteran and non-veteran inmates and found both groups to have a comparable distribution of intelligence scores.[1]

Economic Status

Poverty has been held responsible for nearly all our social ills, including crime and delinquency. To a large extent, economic status is an important factor in the determination of the entire social environment of an individual. It is not difficult to compile statistical data showing poverty as a common factor in studies of most criminals. Too often in the past, those who have studied the influence of economic status have been inclined to infer that, when a particular condition is found more frequently, it therefore plays a crucial role.[2] The truth is, the factor may be merely contributory, and the relation quite indirect.

Discussing the various problems confronting the recently discharged veteran, Wagley concludes that economic insecurity is of fundamental significance.[1] Those individuals with no work experience in civilian life are even more confounded by the readjustment. For many soldiers, their military standard of living was better than they had ever achieved in civilian life. It is a matter of personal importance to these individuals that they be able to maintain a standard of living at least comparable to that in military service. Frustration of aspirations for material success and of desire for material gratifications is an important stimulus to crime.[2]

---

[1] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 125.

[2] Joseph Trenaman..., op. cit., xiii.

An important finding in studies of the relationship between economic status and law violations was that crimes against property, such as theft, burglary and robbery appear to increase in periods of economic depression and unemployment.[3] To the returning veteran, economic security becomes an important consideration and at the very least, the lack of it becomes an irritant upon other conditions of his social environment.

Adjustment to Military Service

In virtually every analysis of ex-service offenders included in this study, it was found that a preponderance of the subjects had disciplinary problems while in the armed forces. Lunden's study of over 5000 ex-service inmates revealed that over thirty-five per cent of them had been discharged under "other than honorable" conditions.[1] To gain insight into individual reactions, the Research Branch of the War Department queried a representative cross-section of men in November 1945 as to the value of their army experience. The majority agreed with the statement, "On the whole I think the army has hurt me more than it has helped me."[2]

---

[1] Perry V. Wagley..., op. cit., 311.

[2] Elmer H. Johnson..., op. cit., 96.

[3] Ibid., 102.

Some of the disciplinary problems encountered by servicemen can be attributed to the nature of military responsibilities. It is important to consider that a service conduct record includes, not only acts that would constitute civil criminal offenses, but various misdemeanors, such as being late for duty or absent without authority. Many of these offenses would scarcely call for official censure in ordinary civilian life. Hakeem's study of 385 incarcerated ex-servicemen showed that 40.8 per cent of them had been punished for AWOL one or more times.[3]

Included in Tables 1 and 2, respectively, are the programs of Basic Combat Training and Advanced Individual Training conducted by the U. S. Army Infantry School at

---

[1] Walter Lunden..., op. cit., 767.

[2] Samuel A. Stouffer and Others..., op. cit., 610.

[3] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 127.

Fort Benning, Georgia.[1] The design of this study precludes specific evaluation of the influence of this training on criminal behavior. A review of the Tables shows a balanced program of military proficiency in the basic training and a decided trend toward combat readiness in the advanced subjects. It is apparent that an overwhelming majority of these subjects stress activities unfamiliar to the average citizen and possibly heighten the anxieties and apprehensions of many new recruits.

Case history studies of young British army offenders by Trenaman extablished that many of their disciplinary problems had been present in the early years of life at school, work and at home.[2] In some cases, the shock of army discipline jolted them back to an earlier state of mind and merely aggravated an existing condition of retarded development. An experimental "Young Soldiers Training Camp" was established for military offenders under 21 years of age with the view of reclaiming them from a career of crime and converting them into good soldiers. A follow-up on the results of this training showed that nearly eighty per cent of those young offenders became average or above in their conduct and attitude.[3]

---

[1] Type Programs, furnished by the Office of Doctrine, Development, Literature and Plans, U. S. Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia.

[2] Joseph Trenaman..., op. cit., 70.

[3] Ibid., 70.

TABLE 1

PROGRAM OF BASIC COMBAT TRAINING

Subject	Hrs.	Subject (Cont.)	Hrs.
Achievements and Traditions	2	Physical Readiness	29
Military Courtesy	3	Physical Contact-Confidence Training	24
Character Guidance	4	Orientation in Stability Operations	1
Code of Conduct	1	Land Navigation	8
Geneva Convention	1	Hand Grenades	5
Military Justice	3	Basic Rifle Marksmanship	83
Command Information	2	Familiarization with US Weapons	4
Driver's Safety	1	Individual Tactics	14
Drill and Ceremonies	28	Marches and Bivouacs	28
Field Sanitation	1	Close Combat Course	4
Personal Hygiene	1	Man Versus Man Reaction	2
First Aid	8	Infiltration Course	3
Individual Protective Meas. Against CBR Attack	4	Proficiency Test	28
Inspections	28	TOTAL HOURS	300
Guard Duty	4		

TABLE 2

PROGRAM OF ADVANCED INDIVIDUAL TRAINING

Subject	Hrs.	Subject (Cont.)	Hrs.
Character Guidance	2	Demolitions Techniques	4
Physical Readiness	24	Crack & Thump Recognition of Foreign Weapons	1
Drill and Ceremonies	9	Patrolling	34
Inspections	10	Technique of Fire and Tactics (Rifle Squad)	56
Land Navigation	21	M60 Machinegun	40
First Aid	4	Close Air and Artillery Support	1
Health Problems in RVN	1	Introduction to Forward Observation	4
Weapons Demonstration	2	Advanced Rifle Marksmanship (M16A1 Rifle)	28
Field Fortifications and Camouflage	2	Current Chemical Weapons	2
Night Vision Devises	4	Survival, Escape and Evasion	9
Communications	12	Proficiency Test	4
Introduction to the M113 Armored Personnel Carrier	7	Helicopter Orientation	1
40-mm Grenade Launcher	5	Quick Kill	4
66-mm HEAT, Rocket	5	Counterambush Techniques	2
50 Cal. Machinegun	8	Cordon and Search	2
45 Cal. Pistol	8	TOTAL HOURS	403
Landmine Warfare	12		
Hand Grenades	2		
VC Boobytraps	1		
RVN Field Tng Exercise	72		

Nature of Civilian Offense

The types of crime committed by ex-servicemen are the most maligned, yet, it would seem, the easiest to ascertain. If military training is related to specific offense categories through activation of the "aggressive urge" and the "wish to kill", it would be logical to assume that the preponderant proportion of the crimes of ex-servicemen would be of an assaultive sort.[1] In a broad classification of offenses, these actions would fall into crimes against the person. Comparative data on ex-service offenders collected by Hakeem did not support such an assumption.[2] The distribution of the types of crimes did not differ in any important way from the non-service subjects. The two groups were compared further as to techniques used in the perpetration of the crime and extent of violence without finding significant differences.

James V. Bennett, former Director of the United States Bureau of Prisons, made a similar observation of veterans in federal prisons and stated: "...robbery and homicide, the violent crimes for which one might expect a high proportion of veterans, were well down the list".[3]

Lunden's tabulation of offenses committed by over 16,000 prison and reformatory inmates revealed that seventy-five per cent of the crimes committed by nearly 6000 ex-service felons were offenses against property.[1] Robbery is the only offense of the more violent type for which veterans occasionally have more than their expected proportion of prison commitments.[2] Statistical comparisons of offenses by these two groups would seem to be adequate rebuttal of the argument that young men who have undergone military training and engaged in physical violence during wars will continue similar activities when they return to civilian life.

---

[1] Perry V. Wagley..., op. cit., 313-314.

[2] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 130.

[3] James V. Bennett, "The Criminality of Veterans", Federal Probation, Vol. 28, (June, 1954), 40-42.

Along with a large number of other variables, the foregoing factors will be considered in relation to the individuals selected for this study. It is important to note that the published studies span a fifty year period. Aside from the occasional contradictions found in these former works, the type of veteran we may now encounter warrants identification.

---

[1] Walter Lunden..., op. cit., 767.

[2] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 124.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

General

As previously conditioned in the study, this project is not designed to identify specific causes of criminality in ex-servicemen. Rather, it is a study of certain characteristics common to a dichotomy of veteran and non-veteran felons to determine those characteristics which signigicantly differentiate one group from the other. Subsequent analysis can then be made to consider the possible influence of military training and experiences on those factors which show such a difference. No attempt will be made to show that significant differences in the dichotomy are a direct result of service in the armed forces. The mere presence of identifiable differences serves a purpose in indicating the direction of further research and provides a basis for valid comparisons of veteran and non-veteran felons.

Two factors must be borne in mind when examining the collected data. First, the study sample is comprised of convicted felons currently incarcerated at the Texas Department of Corrections. The absence of similar data on ex-servicemen who have not come in conflict with the law precludes the application of the findings and interpretations to the whole population of armed forces veterans.

Secondly, the entire law enforcement and judicial systems must be taken into account in that the inquiry is concerned only with incarcerated inmates. Prisoners are a selected group of criminals and an enumeration of their traits and characteristics would, presumably, yield results different from those of all criminals. Probations, suspended sentences and undetected crimes are all considerations which might produce a somewhat different statistical picture.

Assumptions

The effect of service in the armed forces on criminality has been shown to be both nebulous and complex. To reduce the broad range of considerations to a scope within the design of the study, the following assumptions are made: (1) There are statistically significant differences in the selected characteristics of veteran and non-veteran felons; (2) If military training and experiences are related to criminality through the activation of the "aggressive urge" and the "wish to kill", a significant proportion of the crimes of ex-servicemen would be of an aggressive, assaultive nature, usually crimes against the person; (3) Among incarcerated felons, data showing a large proportion of ex-servicemen with no previous criminal record, as compared with non-service inmates, would indicate a basis for closer examination of the relationship between military service and criminality.

Hypothesis

There are inherent difficulties of personal bias in the selection of variables for a dichotomized comparison.

To preclude such a limitation, a multivariate approach was used to examine all of those available at the data processing facilities of the Texas Department of Corrections. Resultant raw data consisted of ninety-nine social, institutional and criminal history variables on each subject.

In consideration of previous research and the suggested influence of military service on criminality, the following hypothesis was formulated: Felony inmates incarcerated at the Texas Department of Corrections, who have been subjected to the training and attitude orientation of military service in the armed forces, demonstrate a more characteristic inclination toward the commission of certain felonious offenses after discharge than do inmates who have not served in the armed forces.

Definition of Major Terms

Veteran.-This term is used in a broad connotation to include those individuals who have performed military duty in any of the service branches of the Department of Defense. These organizations include the Army, Navy, Marine, Air Force, Coast Guard, and the Reserve elements of these elements.

Non-Veteran.-Those individuals who, for various reasons, have never been a member of any branch of the military service.

Ex-serviceman.-An individual who has served a term of duty as a member of the armed forces.

Armed Forces.-The combined military, naval and air forces of the United States of America.

Felon.-An individual convicted of a felony, usually a grave crime declared as such by statute because of the punishment imposed.

Study Variables.-To determine significant differences between two groups, selected characteristics, or variables, may be compared and evaluated and the extent of difference tested for significance by computation. The ninety independent variables ultimately selected for comparison of the study sample are listed in Table 3. The unit of analysis, or dependent variable, used to dichotomize the study sample for comparison was whether or not the subject had served in the armed forces of the United States.

Variables 1 through 13 are social or demographic characteristics which serve to describe the individual subject and his relationship to a measured trait. Variables 14 through 42 refer to prior offenses and confinements of the subjects and provide a statistical picture of the individual or group criminal histories. Variables 43 through 79 are concerned with the offense for which the subject is currently incarcerated and the sentence he received as a result of that crime. Variables 80 through 90 are institutional characteristics and are valuable to correctional personnel in the determination of necessary control and assignment of inmates to the various Texas Department of Correction units.

TABLE 3

STUDY VARIABLES

Variable Number	Variable	Type of Variable
1.	Year of Birth	D
2.	Nativity	D
3.	Citizenship	D
4.	Residence	D
5.	Marital Status	D
6.	Religion	D
7.	Race	D
8.	Original Educational Achievement	D
9.	Original Intelligence Quotient	D
10.	Original Number of College Hours	D
11.	Present Educational Achievement	D
12.	Present Intelligence Quotient	D
13.	Present Number of College Hours	D
14.	Number of Co-Defendants	P
15.	Detainers-Texas	P
16.	Detainers-Other States	P
17.	Detainers-Federal	P
18.	Detainers-Immigration	P
19.	Suspended Sentences-Adult	P
20.	Suspended Sentences-Juvenile	P
21.	Probated Federal-Adult	P
22.	Probated Federal-Juvenile	P
23.	Probated State-Adult	P
24.	Probated State-Juvenile	P
25.	Detention Home Confinements	P
26.	Jail Confinements	P
27.	Reformatory Confinements	P
28.	Military Prison Confinements(includes stockade)	P
29.	TDC Confinements	P
30.	Other Prisons Confinements	P
31.	Escapes Completed-Juvenile	P
32.	Escapes Completed-Other Institutions	P
33.	Escapes Completed-TDC	P
34.	Escapes Completed-Other Prisons	P
35.	Escapes Attempted-Juvenile	P
36.	Escapes Attempted-Other Institutions	P
37.	Escapes Attempted-TDC	P
38.	Escapes Attempted-Other Prisons	P
39.	Parole Violations-Juvenile	P
40.	Parole Violations-Other Institutions	P
41.	Parole Violations-TDC	P
42.	Parole Violations-Other Prisons	P
43.	Years of Minimum Sentence	C
44.	Years of Maximum Sentence	C
45.	Number of Offenses	C

TABLE 3 (continued)

Variable Number	Variable	Type of Variable
46.	Number of Offenses-Unknown	C
47.	Murder	C
48.	Rape	C
49.	Robbery	C
50.	Assault	C
51.	Burglary	C
52.	Theft over $50	C
53.	Auto Theft	C
54.	Arson	C
55.	Forgery	C
56.	Fraud	C
57.	Stolen Property	C
58.	Offense Against State Government	C
59.	Weapons	C
60.	Prostitution	C
61.	Sex Offenses	C
62.	Drugs	C
63.	Gambling	C
64.	Offense Involving Family	C
65.	Driving While Intoxicated	C
66.	Liquor	C
67.	Breaking and Entering a Motor Vehicle	C
68.	Escapes	C
69.	Assault with Intent to Commit an Offense	C
70.	Embezzelment	C
71.	Malicious Mischief	C
72.	Kidnapping	C
73.	Conspiracy	C
74.	Offense Against the State	C
75.	Offense Against the Rights of Sufferage	C
76.	Offense Against Public Justice	C
77.	Offense Against Public Peace	C
78.	Offense Against Public Policy	C
79.	Offense Against Public Property	C
80.	Trustee Status	I
81.	Original Segregative Class	I
82.	Original Security Class	I
83.	Present Segregative Class	I
84.	Present Security Class	I
85.	Original Medical Group	I
86.	Original Medical Class	I
87.	Present Medical Group	I
88.	Present Medical Class	I
89.	Number of Times in Solitary Confinement	I
90.	Offense for Solitary Confinement	I

NOTE: D=Demographic; P=Prior Offense; C=Current Offense; I=Institutional Variables.

Procedures

Description and Selection of the Study Sample

Due to the availability of extensive programmed data in the Sam Houston State University Computer Center and the proximity of the Bureau of Records and Identification of the Texas Department of Corrections, it was decided that the study sample be selected from the entire inmate population of the Texas Department of Corrections. On February 13, 1970, raw data concerned with 12,784 prisoners incarcerated at that institution was considered in the sampling procedure.

The criteria for selection of the dichotomy were inmates born after the year 1930 and whether or not they had served in the armed forces. The reasoning for the age limitation was to obtain a sampling of veterans who had participated in the most recent programs of military training. Published studies of ex-service offenders have been related, in part, to training or participation in one or the other of the two World Wars. World War II ended more than twenty years ago. Our changing social environment and the nature of the undeclared conflicts in Korea and Vietnam merit consideration as influencing factors in the type of veteran we may now encounter.

Utilizing the foregoing criteria, the computer selected sample consisted of 4000 non-veterans and 2352 veterans. Since the initial inquiry was based on information previously compiled, it was not necessary to delete individual subjects due to inadequacy of records. Non-availability of certain institutional testing scores on some inmates did not significantly affect the comparative results due to the large number of subjects. Tables of variables wherein testing scores were not available include a notation to that effect and indicate their relative significance.

Of the original ninety-nine variables, certain discrepancies were noted in those concerned with, (1) Vocational Classification, (2) Vocational Status, and, (3) General Occupational Choice. Co-ordination with the Bureau of Records and Identification of the Texas Department of Corrections revealed that the collection of data concerning these variables had been discontinued. These factors were dropped from all statistical comparisons because they were no longer valid. Four institutional variables, (1) Previous Departure Code, (2) Previous Unit Departed, (3) Last Unit, and, (4) Present Unit involved purely administrative information. These variables were deleted from consideration in that they served no constructive purpose in the study. One female veteran was included in the original frequency distribution, but the variable of Sex was dropped due to the statistical inadequacy of only one subject. Finally, as military service is the dependent variable for cross-tabulation against other characteristics, it was dropped as an independent variable. The foregoing deletions reduced the study to a total of ninety variables.

During the period February 1, 1970, to March 31, 1970, over two hundred recently incarcerated veterans responded to a brief questionnaire concerned with military training, experiences and the criminal offense for which they had been confined. The interviews were conducted at the Diagnostic Center of the Texas Department of Corrections which initially processes all newly received prisoners. The responses by the inmates were voluntary and the basis for selection in the study included all prisoners who met the previously established criteria. The questions used in these interviews are included in Appendix B, page 89. The tabulated responses and analysis of the results are discussed in Chapter III.[1]

Method of Analysis

Basic data on the study sample were obtained through computer print-out in the form of frequency distribution Tables involving ninety variables applicable to each subject.[2] This information had been compiled through sociological interviews of each inmate by correctional personnel. Due to the large number of subjects included in the study, verification of individual records was deemed impractical, and the accuracy of the information must be accepted as statistically valid. After an initial review of these Tables, some portions were consolidated to preclude redundancy of similar variables.

---

[1] See Table 6, Chapter III.

[2] Frequency distributions for all variables are presented in Appendix A.

Examination of the raw data revealed it to be generally classified into two types suitable for measurement of variance. Seventy of the variables were determined to consist of continuous data and the remaining twenty variables consisted of discrete data. Specifically, discrete data is based on measurements which can only be expressed in whole units. Although statistical data tends to be treated as only continuous, it is important that the distinction be made in a valid test of significant differences between variables.

To test the significance of the differences found in the comparison of veteran and non-veteran felons, the Chi Square Test was used with the twenty discrete variables and the _t_-Test was used with the seventy continuous variables.[1] The Chi Square test of significance was also used in the analysis of the prisoner response questionnaire. These testing methods are described in relation to interpretation of the statistical findings in Chapter III.

The statistical computation of levels of significance does not answer the question of why there is a difference between variables. The selected criterion for significance in this study is a probability of error less than 5 in 100 ($p < .05$). With variables compared by this standard, it can be reasonably concluded that chance alone did not account for the differences found. Through interpretation of significant differences found in this study and a subjective comparison of previous studies with the present findings of significance, the hypothesis may be sustained or rejected.

---

[1] See N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), 160-175.

CHAPTER III

STATISTICAL FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

General

An interpretation of data involved with the large number of independent variables selected for this study necessitates frequent reference to presentation of the information in Table format. Due to the voluminous nature of the basic Frequency Distribution Tables, they are included for reference in Appendix A. The data contained in these Tables represent the frequency and comparative percentage of occurrence for each of the measured characteristics in the study. A total of ninety variables were ultimately selected for comparison of the dichotomy. Nine of the available variables were deleted for reasons previously explained.

The purpose of the study has been to seek the broadest possible approach to a statistical comparison of veteran and non-veteran felons. The acknowledged benefits of computerized data has made possible the inclusion of over 6000 subjects, evaluated against an extensive array of variables. The basic interest was to determine whether differences found in the dichotomy were real differences or merely a factor of chance. Differences found with the probability of error criterion selected for this study can be expected to appear in future samples of such individuals.

Results of Chi Square

Table 4 is a presentation of the results of the Chi

Square Test. The first column in Table 4 lists the twenty variables previously identified as discrete data. The next three columns indicate the corresponding chi square, degrees of freedom, and the probability value relative to each variable. To facilitate review of these statistics, the method of computation and relationship to the variables requires brief discussion.

Chi square is used as a test of significance when discrete data is expressed in frequencies. Essentially, this is a test to determine the significance of differences found in empirically observed frequencies and the expected frequencies, i.e., those expected to happen if chance alone accounted for the difference. The test is not intended to determine cause and effect of characteristics measured. The Chi Square Test simply indicates the extent to which the difference between the observed and expected frequencies could occur by chance. The computed chi square for each variable is entered in the second column of Table 4.

Probability values refer to how often the observed difference could happen by chance alone. These values range from 1 to 0, where a value of 1 stands for absolute certainty and 0, for no chance at all that the event will occur. These values are listed in the fourth column of Table 4. Inspection of the cells in the Frequency Distribution Tables indicate the direction of the comparative difference.

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF CHI SQUARE TEST

Variable	Chi Square	Degrees Freedom	Probability
Year of Birth	278.547	5	0.0001
Nativity	236.795	4	0.0001
Citizenship	4.528	1	0.0315
Residence	119.808	4	0.0001
Marital Status	375.369	6	0.0001
Religion	51.04	2	0.0001
Race	781.119	2	0.0001
Orig. Ed. Achievement	984.075	4	0.0001
Orig. Intl. Quotient	892.937	5	0.0001
Pres. Ed. Achievement	613.368	4	0.0001
Pres. Intl. Quotient	940.313	5	0.0001
Orig. No. Col. Hrs.	4.544	2	0.1014
Pres. No. Col. Hrs.	5.839	2	0.0528
Trustee Status	81.166	6	0.0001
Orig. Seg. Class	22.142	2	0.0001
Orig. Sectional Class	3.794	1	0.0487
Pres. Seg. Class	22.142	2	0.0001
Pres. Sectional Class	3.794	1	0.0487
Orig. Medical Group	4.536	2	0.0981
Pres. Medical Group	4.784	2	0.0899
Orig. Medical Class	2.768	4	0.6004
Pres. Medical Class	2.979	4	0.5641
Solitary Offense	169.133	2	0.0001

Results of t-Test

Table 5 is a presentation of the results of the *t*-Test for significance of differences in the seventy variables identified as continuous data. The first column lists the variables considered for comparison. The next four columns represent the corresponding means of the dichotomy, *t* ratio and probability value of each variable.

Very simply, the *t* ratio is derived through dividing the difference between the means by a standard deviation. In this instance, the standard deviation is the standard of error of the difference between the means compared. The *t* ratio can then be used to determine the significance of an observed difference. A general rule for evaluating the *t* ratio is the higher the value of *t*, the more confidence you can have that the two groups differ. However, the probability value, entered in column four, is the most valid measure of significance.

Discussion of Significant Variables

Perusal of the probability values computed for each variable in Tables 4 and 5 reveal a large number of the comparative differences to be statistically significant. This finding of real difference is singularly important in that it establishes a purposeful basis for comparison of the data and allows an evaluation of the direction of the difference. Although the variables were tested for significant difference by two methods, the resultant probability value

TABLE 5

RESULTS OF t-TEST

	Means		t	
Variable	NV	V	Ratio	P
No. Co-Defenants	0.900	0.654	7.589	0.0001
Detainers-Texas	0.043	0.43	0.072	0.9400
Detainers-O/States	0.022	0.024	0.346	0.7291
Detainers-Federal	0.008	0.013	1.486	0.1332
Detainers-Immigration	0.001	0.0	2.030	0.0397
Suspended Sent.-Adult	0.063	0.080	2.448	0.0137
Suspended Sent.-Juvenile	0.0	0.003	1.410	0.1545
Probation Federal-Adult	0.020	0.032	2.631	0.0084
Probation State-Juvenile	0.178	0.097	7.184	0.0001
Probation Federal-Juvenile	0.003	0.0	2.034	0.0393
Probation State-Adult	0.413	0.463	3.420	0.0009
Detention Home Confinement	1.598	0.484	12.726	0.0001
Jail Confinement	3.989	3.586	2.715	0.0067
Reformatory Confinement	0.663	0.226	14.368	0.0001
Military Confinement	0.0	0.457	30.090	0.0001
TDC Confinement	0.629	0.508	5.202	0.0001
O/Prisons Confinement	0.204	0.326	7.079	0.0001
Juvenile Escapes Completed	0.262	0.087	7.240	0.0001
O/Institutions Escapes Comp.	0.147	0.119	1.713	0.0826
TDC Escapes Attempted	0.003	0.007	2.320	0.0192
O/Prisons Escapes	0.011	0.029	4.271	0.0001
Juvenile Escapes Attempted	0.034	0.012	3.065	0.0025
O/Inst. Escapes Attempted	0.028	0.021	1.128	0.2580
TDC Escapes Attempted	0.004	0.005	0.327	0.7425
O/Prison Escapes Attempted	0.004	0.007	1.556	0.1154
Parole Violations-Juvenile	0.002	0.001	1.079	0.2801
Parole Violations-O/Inst.	0.001	0.001	1.033	0.3019
Parole Violations-TDC	0.120	0.098	2.608	0.0091
Parole Violations-O/Prisons	0.009	0.018	2.566	0.0100
Years-Minimum Sentence	7.799	6.490	2.608	0.0089
Years-Maximum Sentence	105.817	87.818	2.496	0.0120
Number of Offenses	2.015	1.929	1.437	0.1465
Unknown Offenses	0.006	0.043	6.683	0.0001
Murder	0.127	0.120	3.053	0.2021
Rape	0.071	0.054	2.288	0.2018
Robbery	0.468	0.465	0.167	0.8617
Assault	0.004	0.004	0.139	0.8842
Burglary	0.607	0.448	4.129	0.0001
Theft Over $50	0.290	0.278	00.649	0.5232
Auto Theft	0.007	0.011	1.261	0.2044
Arson	0.008	0.008	0.197	0.8379
Forgery	0.134	0.210	3.938	0.0002
Fraud	0.011	0.039	6.029	0.0001
Stolen Property	0.001	0.002	0.850	0.6001

TABLE 5 (continued)

Variable	Means NV	Means V	t Ratio	P
State Government	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Weapons	0.008	0.008	0.107	0.9110
Prostitution	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Sex Offenses	0.021	0.033	2.124	0.0315
Drugs	0.106	0.099	0.758	0.5453
Gambling	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Offense-Family	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
DWI	0.002	0.012	4.08	0.0001
Liquor	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Breaking & Entering Motor Veh.	0.017	0.008	2.115	0.0322
Escapes	0.012	0.011	0.417	0.6798
Assault With Intent	0.098	0.080	2.038	0.0389
Embezzlement	0.001	0.006	2.246	0.0231
Malicious Mischief	0.003	0.003	0.192	0.8418
Kidnapping	0.002	0.003	0.422	0.6761
Conspiracy	0.001	0.001	0.319	0.7481
Offense Against State	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Offense-Rights/Suffrage	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Offense-Public Justice	0.0007	0.0008	0.137	0.8855
Offense-Public Peace	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Offense-Public Policy	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Offense-Public Property	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0000
Times in Solitary	0.326	0.204	7.079	0.0001

NOTE: V=Veterans; NV=Non-Veterans; P=Probability Value.

is statistically comparable for all characteristics measured.

Fifty of the ninety variables tested met the selected probability criterion of less than .05. A narrational listing of these variables would be unnecessarily redundant. The significance of the variables will be discussed in accordance with the earlier grouping of, (1) Demographic, (2) Prior Offense, (3) Current Offense, and, (4) Institutional characteristics.[1] Discussion by these guidelines will assist in evaluating the relationship of service in the armed forces and specific criminality.

Demographic Variables

Nearly sixty per cent (57.77) of the veterans were over thirty years of age while approximately the same percentage (61.93) of non-veterans were twenty-nine years of age or younger. Since the criterion for selection of the study sample established specific limits for this variable, the finding merits consideration. One of the most obvious explanations is that veterans had not been generally subjected to civilian law enforcement during their period of military service. The average tour of duty for non-career servicemen is from two to three years and it can be expected that non-veterans inclined toward criminality would come into conflict with civilian law at a somewhat earlier age. This finding was generally in agreement with the study conducted by Hakeem. A comparison of over 500 inmates disclosed the modal age of ex-servicemen to be 21.7 years and the non-veteran to be 19.8 years.[1]

---

[1] See page 32 of this study for review of categories.

Hasty conclusions that service in the armed forces might deter early delinquency must consider the military disciplinary record of the veteran. The referenced study by Hakeem showed that 40.8 per cent of the subjects had been punished for military offenses one or more times.[2] Trenaman's research on 6,177 British soldiers revealed 23 per cent of them had been absent without leave at least once but about 4 per cent of the men accounted for nearly half the absences.[3] The incarcerated veteran will be comparably older than his non-service counterpart but this is interpreted as a condition of exposure to civilian law enforcement rather than nebulous proposals that military service discourages early delinquent behavior.

The Texas County of birth and residence of the subjects were found to be significant in two areas. More veterans (35.49%) than non-veterans (19.24%) found their way to the Texas Department of Corrections after birth and residence in other states. Service in the armed forces is necessarily a mobile existence. Induction may be in one state, training in another and duty in still a third. Military authorities attempt to discharge servicemen near their homes but they may be released from duty at a location different from the preceeding three. Consequent exposure to other parts of the country, as well as business or personal ties at former duty stations perpetuates this mobility and might explain the high percentage of out-of-state veteran felons. Geographic nativity within the state showed a slight variance but this can be attributed to business and population centers which would be expected to produce a higher proportion of offenders.

---

[1] Michael Hakeem..., op. cit., 125.

[2] Ibid., 127.

[3] Joseph Trenaman..., op. cit., 123.

The marital status variable interestingly differed from Sutherland's findings of divorced inmates heading the commitment rate.[1] Over one-half of the non-veterans (53.85%) were single and the veterans were equally divided between married (31.20%) and single (31.12%). The incidence of divorce in the dichotomy was relatively insignificant. A tentative explanation for the higher proportion of single persons in the non-veteran group may be their comparatively younger age. A review of previous studies did not disclose a logical interpretation of this finding.

Proportionately, there were twice as many Caucasian veterans (65.17%) as non-veteran (29.60%) Caucasians. Over seventy per cent (70.39) of the non-veteran felons were Negroes (47.02) and Mexicans (23.37). Military authorities have long noticed a relatively high rate of re-enlistment among Negro soldiers. Stouffer noticed that in expressions of pride in his unit, sense of importance to his army job, and interest in his job, the Negro soldier's attitudes were generally more favorable than the white soldier.[1] It would very probably be unwarranted speculation to assume that military service favorably influenced the conduct of Negro soldiers to the extent shown in the study sample. However, readjustment to the civilian environment has been an accepted problem of veterans. Stouffer noted that the civilian past of most Negroes was not in such sharp contrast to their military experiences as to invite unfavorable comparisons as a source of discontent with the military. The low probability of a chance difference (.0001) for this comparison and the high chi square value (781.119) would recommend it for inclusion in future studies.

---

[1] Edwin Sutherland and Donald Cressey..., op. cit., 230.

The comparative educational achievement and measured intelligence quotients of the subjects were markedly significant. The veteran felon possessed a much higher intelligence quotient (90.2) than the non-veteran (70.1). Tests administered during initial processing at the Diagnostic Unit revealed the veteran's educational achievement level to be approximately the eighth grade while the non-veterans were rated at the sixth grade level. Surely, the first consideration in this finding is the fact that military personnel must meet minimum intelligence standards prior to induction into the service. The important fact is that this does not necessarily set a standard higher than that of the average citizen but sets them distinctively apart from the non-veteran felon. The finding is quite different from previous studies which found both groups to have a comparable distribution of intelligence scores.

---

[1] Samuel A. Stouffer and Others..., op. cit., 623.

Educational achievement, intelligence and illiteracy have been tested as characteristics in descriptive approaches to criminology for some time.[1] In his study of military offenders, Stouffer noted that high school graduates or college men adjusted better to military discipline than grade school men or high school drop-outs and had less chance of being in a military stockade for military offenses. The design of the present study does not permit analysis of these factors beyond the determination of significant difference and that relationship to previous findings.

Prior Offense Variables

Nineteen of the twenty-nine characteristics pertinent to the criminal history of the subjects were determined to be statistically significant by comparison. The insignificant variables were largely the victim of very low frequency rates and are notably absent in previous studies.

The non-veteran tended to commit his crime with the assistance of at least one person (76%), while the veteran generally acted alone (60%). As a consequence to his actions, over fifty per cent of the non-veterans had been confined at least once in some form of correctional facility. Over sixty-five per cent of the veterans had not been previously confined but the remainder would seem to substantiate the contention that ex-service felons are not new comers to criminal justice. Proportionately, nearly twice the number of non-veterans (35.9%) as veterans (18.37%) were committed to juvenile detention homes.

---

[1] Hermann Mannheim..., Comparative Criminology, op. cit., 3.

An interesting combination of statistics reveals:

1. Trenaman reported thirty-six per cent of the soldiers in his study had been convicted of indictable offenses before coming into the service.[1]
2. Thirty-five per cent of this study sample were previously confined in civilian correctional facilities.
3. Lunden found that thirty-five per cent of the ex-service felons he studied had received "other than honorable" discharges.[2]
4. Over thirty per cent of this study sample had been found guilty of military misconduct and confined in military correctional facilities.

Certainly one consequence of this sequence of similarities is that the armed forces have the formidable problem of seeking methods to identify this criminal element. One of the observed traits in recidivists is habit formation; persistence in crime is merely persistence of habits.[3] The criminal, by reason of his crime and the methods of dealing with his crime, forms associations, loyalities and attitudes which tend to persist. Detailed studies designed to analyze the deviate behavior of habitual juvenile offenders should provide enough information to preclude induction of such individuals. Repeated military offenders could be retained longer under military authority to more carefully scrutinize their potential for rehabilitation rather than discharge them into the civilian environment which provides wider opportunities for misconduct. The Military Correctional Training Facility, Fort Riley, Kansas, has been established with this aim in mind but is selective in assignment of personnel. The Department of the Army cannot be held responsible for correction of our societal delinquents but expansion of this program might make a significant contribution to that end.

---

[1] Joseph Trenaman..., op. cit., 147.

[2] Walter Lunden..., op. cit., 767.

[3] Edwin Sutherland and Donald Cressey..., op. cit., 666.

Current Offense Variables

Only thirteen of the thirty-seven variables connected with the offense for which the subjects were incarcerated met the probability criterion. Nine of the insignificant variables were due to the fact that neither of the groups had committed the offense. A brief look at Table 5 shows that these were unusual crimes, i.e., Offense Against Rights of Sufferage, and their elimination from comparison is not considered important.

The veteran received a slightly shorter sentence, (Min.-6 yrs/Max.-87 yrs) than the non-veteran (Min.-7 yrs/ Max.-105 yrs). This is interpreted as representative of the more active criminal history of the non-veteran and the fact that the group was convicted of more offenses (Mean=2.0) than the veterans (Mean=1.9). These factors are judicial considerations in sentencing procedures. The relatively high maximum for non-veterans was due to 370 life sentences, more than twice the number for veterans (179), and cannot be explained without a disparity study of a number of factors.

The aggressive, assaultive types of crime were carefully scrutinized since it has been charged that military training influences the commission of such crimes.[1] The frequencies of offenses for murder, rape, robbery, and assault were compared without finding important differences between the two groups. Sutherland had reported that a slightly disproportionate number of veterans were convicted for robbery but this was not supported in the present study.[2]

Willard Waller had charged that military service weakens the taboos against sexual indulgence.[3] The subjects in this sample revealed a slightly higher proportion of sex offenses for veterans (2.56%) than non-veterans (1.78%) but the incident rate was so small that the finding is not considered of importance.

Examination of the computed means reveal that both veterans and non-veterans were most likely to be incarcerated for robbery and burglary. Recapitulation of the current

---

[1] Perry V. Wagley..., op. cit., 313-314.

[2] Edwin Sutherland and Donald Cressey..., op. cit., 257.

[3] Willard Waller..., op. cit., 197.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

offense variables is not necessary to conclude that the study supports most of the previous findings of no important differences between veteran and non-veteran felons in the incident rate of violent crimes.

In general support of these findings and previous studies of the assaultive nature of crimes, the following study on the relationship between crimes against the person and property crimes is considered pertinent:

> In order to test the hypothesis that the personal offender and the property offender would show statistically significant psychological differences, 242 inmates at Marion Correctional Institution, Marion, Ohio, were administered the California Psychological Inventory Test. The test results were subjected to a *t*-Test. The results of the *t*-Test indicated that statistically significant differences (beyond .05) did not exist between the personal offender and the property offender. These experimental groups showed no significant difference on 11 of the 12 personality scales of the CPI. The hypothesis that the personal offender would show significant psychological differences was not supported.[1]

Institutional Variables

Seven of the eleven institutional variables tested revealed significant differences in the subjects while incarcerated. The four variables determined insignificant are concerned with medical classification and groupings by correctional personnel. The inmates are classified on a scale from 1 (Physically Fit-No Restriction for Work) to 5 (Handicapped-Special Assignment Necessary). The reason for the insignificant computation is almost identical frequency rates for both groups. The lack of significance here is important in that it aptly eliminates physical fitness as a consideration in the relative criminality of the two groups.

---

[1] Robert A. Merkel, "The Relationship Between Crimes Against the Person and Property Crimes", *Abstracts of Theses and Dissertation*, Vol. XI, Bowling Green State University (1967).

Segregation classifications at the Texas Department of Corrections are based on a scale of, (1) I. First Offender, (2) II. Recidivist, and (3) III. High Risk-Malcontents. A comparison of the percentages for these groups with confinement data presented earlier reveals a slight inconsistency. Veterans confined in military stockades, even for periods less than 30 days, are classified as institutional recidivists. To an extent, this distorts the frequency tabulation. Another administrative procedure at the Texas Department of Corrections almost automatically places newly arrived inmates in a security class of 7 (Maximum Security). This action resulted in less than one-half of one per cent of the veterans and only one per cent of the non-veterans selectively placed in the other classifications. Interpretation of this variable would serve no purpose.

The remaining variables relate to administrative treatment of misconduct by inmates. There were no important differences in the nature of misconduct but nearly twice as many non-veterans (38.35%) than veterans (21.73%) were punished by solitary confinement. A tentative interpretation of this information is that ex-servicemen have been exposed to more stringent standards of discipline than the average individual. The organization of security officers and strict adherence to certain regulations in the correctional environment is not unlike the military service. Another consideration is that the veteran is somewhat older than his non-service counterpart and may more maturely guide his conduct with prudence and forethought.

Responses to Questionnaire Items

Table 6 is a presentation of the responses by two hundred ex-service felons to questions relating to their military service and its influence on their lives. The interview was conducted in private and participation by the inmate was voluntary. Each individual was admonished that there were no right or wrong answers and that his personal opinion should control the response. The computed chi square and probability values indicate the responses to be valid measures of significance and not a factor of chance.

Review of the questions and inspection of the cells in the distribution Table indicates the collective direction of the difference in the responses. The questionnaire was designed to test various premises of the study and was not intended to prove or disprove the specifics of an individual question. The military record of the subjects was remarkably similar to that of the 2352 man study sample. Fifty-two of the subjects (26%) had been convicted by military courts martial and sixteen subjects (8%) had received "other than honorable" discharges.

TABLE 6

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INCARCERATED EX-SERVICEMEN

Question[1]	Very Much	Somewhat	Not At All	Total	X^2	P*
1.	50	86	64	200	9.89	.01
2.	84	68	48	200	9.74	.01
3.	35	45	120	200	64.83	.001
4.	36	44	120	200	64.15	.001
5.	84	68	48	200	9.74	.01

Degrees of Freedom=2; X^2=Chi Square; P=Probability Value; *All question responses met probability criterion of $<.05$.

---

[1] Questions for response by ex-service felons were:

1. Do you think the combat training you received in the military service made you more physically aggressive?

2. Do you believe the strict nature of military discipline influenced you toward improving your personal conduct?

3. Did discipline problems you had in the military service make it difficult for you to find work in the civilian occupation you desired?

4. Do you feel that your training and experiences in the military service influenced you in any way to commit the felony for which you were convicted?

5. If you had a son, would you encourage him to seek a career in the military service?

The frequency of responses to the first question would seem to support the contention that military training influences the aggressive nature of the individual. A qualification in this respect is that the subjects were convicted felons and responses to this question by ex-servicemen who have not come in conflict with the law might be quite different. Another consideration is that opinion involves self-concept. The statistical comparison of assaultive crimes by ex-servicemen did not support such a position.

The nature of the response to the second question is unique in that it concerns improved conduct and the respondents are convicted felons. The only explanation for this result is that some seventy-four per cent of the queried subjects received honorable discharges and presumably, considered the military experience a profitable one. This response is similarly reflected in the response to the fifth question.

The third question was designed to measure the relationship of readjustment problems to incidence of crime caused by such frustration. Too often, the inductee has wanted civilian life so badly and idealized it so much that it cannot possibly measure up to his hopes. The lack of a civilian occupational skill and the stigma of a military punitive discharge can frequently turn a veteran to criminal pursuits. The fact that such a overwhelming number responded as they did would imply that even the subjects with unfavorable discharges did not experience such a problem.

The responses to question four certainly contributes to a rebuttal of the premise that military service influences specific criminality. The question was worded to elicit all personal considerations and was patterened after an almost identical question proposed by Walter A. Lunden in his study of ex-service inmates.[1] The responses to Lunden's question were (1) Yes (27%), (2) Undecided (10%), and, (3) No (63%). The proportional responses for the present study were (1) Very Much (18%), (2) Somewhat (22%), and, (3) Not at all (60%). It can be reasonably concluded that, at least the perpetrators of the criminal offenses, do not consider military service to be an influencing factor.

The intent of the fifth question was to measure the general attitude of the veteran concerning his military experiences. It encompasses the responses to all the other questions and is consistent with the subsequent results. The general interpretation is that the incarcerated veteran looks back on his military service with a degree of satisfaction, accomplishment and decidedly not the cause of his present position in the civilian environment.

---

[1] Walter Lunden..., op. cit., 767.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of the Study

The objective of this study has been to make an evaluative comparison of veteran and non-veteran felons incarcerated in the Texas Department of Corrections and to consider the influence of military service on subsequent criminal behavior. An analysis of statistically significant differences between veteran and non-veteran inmates would assist in the identification of criminally oriented adults and undesireable delinquents prior to induction into the armed forces. Significant differences found in veterans consequent to military training would indicate a need for further research and reconsideration of discharge procedures by the Department of Defense. Objective comparison of significant differences will permit a qualified evaluation of the contention that military service may give individuals a criminalist orientation.

The availability of extensive, computer-programmed data made it practical to select the study sample from the entire inmate population of the Texas Department of Corrections. The criteria for selection of the proposed dichotomy were inmates born after the year 1930 and whether or not they had ever served in the armed forces. The age limitation was established to obtain a sampling of veterans who had participated in the most recent methods of military training.

Ninety independent variables were ultimately selected and cross-tabulated against the dependent variables to obtain raw data in the form of frequency distributions. Each characteristic was subsequently tested for comparative significance by statistical computation of the chi square and t ratio. Two hundred veterans confined at the Texas Department of Corrections were interviewed and responded to a brief questionnaire concerned with their military experiences, training and the offense for which they had been incarcerated. An analysis and interpretation of the foregoing data provided the basis for acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis.

Findings

Based on the accumulative data presented in this study, it has been generally found that:

1. There are statistically significant differences in the social, criminal history and institutional characteristics of veteran and non-veteran felons incarcerated at the Texas Department of Corrections.
2. Ex-service felons at the Texas Department of Corrections are characteristically older, more intelligent, Caucasian males who received somewhat shorter sentences than their non-service counterparts.
3. Approximately thirty per cent of the ex-service felons had been confined in military and/or civilian correctional facilities prior to incarceration at the Texas Department of Corrections.
4. There are no important differences in the types of crime perpetrated by veteran and non-veteran felons incarcerated at the Texas Department of Corrections.
5. Ex-service felons more readily adjust to the

disciplinary restrictions of the correctional treatment environment than do non-service felons.

6. No substantive basis was found to conclude that there is a relationship between military service and specific criminality.

These findings collectively reject the hypothesis that ex-service felons at the Texas Department of Corrections would be inclined toward specific criminality as a result of their military service and training. Certain portions of the study have revealed characteristics and criminal history traits of the ex-service felon that suggest further research. Studies designed to examine the significant differences identified in this study more extensively might prove to be valuable in rehabilitative efforts concerned with ex-service felons.

Recommendations

It is important to remember that there is no such thing as an innate or inherent criminal disposition. In spite of pessimistic statements to the contrary, no felon, however hardened, is irrevocably beyond all hope of reform. The fact that ex-servicemen constitute a sizeable proportion of correctional populations is sufficient evidence of the need for specialized rehabilitation programs. No one knows better than the specialist in behavior the effect of loss of honor and a feeling of worth on the ex-felon's personal and social adjustment. Some of these soldiers will not be willing to accept these contingencies and compensate by continuing in socially deviant behavior. With these thoughts in mind, the following recommendations are made:

1. Further studies be designed and conducted with the intent of exploiting the significant differences identified in this study.

2. Armed forces induction standards be continually reappraised to circumscribe the acceptance of delinquently oriented and unsuitable personnel who characteristically persist in deviant behavior.

3. Repeated military offenders of strictly service related infractions be routinely assigned to the Military Correctional Training Facility at Fort Riley, Kansas, to more carefully evaluate their potential for rehabilitation.

4. Contact Service personnel in regional offices of the Veterans Administration be required to coordinate with correctional administrators in their area to assist eligible ex-servicemen in adjustment to civilian endeavors through pre-release programs and after final discharge.

Occasional allegations about the shattering experience of military service and combat are likely to continue. It is true that some men are physically ruined by injuries sustained in combat and others bear mental scars which will never disappear. But unless the data reviewed in this study are to be largely disregarded, there seems little reason to doubt that the ex-service felon can be reabsorbed into the normal patterns of American life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Best, Harry, *Crime and the Criminal Law in the United States*. New York: The MacMillian Company, 1930.

Downie, N. M. and Heath, R. W., *Basic Statistical Methods*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor, *Afterconduct of Discharged Veterans*. London: MacMillian and Company, 1946.

Janowitz, Morris, *The Professional Soldier*. Michigan: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.

Johnson, Elmer Hubert, *Crime, Correction, and Society*. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1968.

Lee, Alfred McClung and Elizabeth Briant, *Social Problems in America*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1949.

Mannheim, Hermann, *Social Aspects of Crime in England Between the Wars*. London: George Allen and Unwin LTD., 1940.

Mannheim, Hermann, *Comparative Criminology*. London: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Preschel, Barbara (Ed), *Current Projects in the Prevention, Control, and Treatment of Crime and Delinquency*. New York: Edwards Bros. Inc., Vol. III, 1963.

Reckless, Walter C., *Criminal Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Comp., Inc., 1940.

Robinson, Louis Newton, *Criminal Statistics in the United States*. New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1969.

Rogers, Carl R. and Wallen, John L., *Counselling with Returning Servicemen*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1946.

Spencer, John C., *Crime and the Services*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul LTD., 1954.

Stouffer, Samuel A., (Others), *The American Soldier*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, Vol. II, Studies in Social Psychology in World War II., 1949.

Sutherland, Edwin H. and Cressey, Donald R., *Principles of Criminology*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., Seventh Edition, 1966.

Sykes, Gresham M. and Drabek, Thomas E., Law and the Lawless. New York: Randon House, 1969.

Toynbee, Arnold J., War and Civilization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Trenaman, Joseph, Out of Step. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952.

Waller, Willard, The Veteran Comes Back. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1944.

Wolfgang, Marvin E. and Ferracuti, Franco, The Subculture of Violence. London: Tavistock Publications, 1967.

Articles

Bennett, James V., "The Criminality of Veterans", Federal Probation. Vol. 28, June, 1954. 40-42.

Hakeem, Michael, "Service in the Armed Forces and Criminality", Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. Vol. 37, July-August, 1946. 120-137.

Lunden, Walter A., "Military Service and Criminality", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science. Vol. 42, March-April, 1952. 766-773.

Wagley, Perry V., "Some Criminological Implications of the Returning Soldier", Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. Vol. 34, January-February, 1944. 313-324.

Willbach, Harry, "Recent Crimes and the Veterans", Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology.

Reports

Third U. N. Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. Stockholm: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 1967.

Others

Clark, Marsh, "My-Lai: An American Tragedy", Time Magazine. Vol. 94, No. 23, December 5, 1969. 24-32.

Merkle, Robert A., "The Relationship Between Crimes Against the Person and Property Crimes", Abstracts of Theses and Dissertations. Vol. XI, Bowling Green University, 1967.

Shellhause, Brand, "A Descriptive Study of the Uneducated AWOL Offender", Crime and Delinquency Abstracts. Vol. 5, No. 4, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1963. 315.

Shellhause, Brand, "A Demographic Study of Convicted Felons Who Later Became Military Offenders", Crime and Delinquency Abstracts. Vol. 5, 1963. 316.

Type Programs; Basic Combat Training and Advanced Individual Training. Office of Doctrine, Development, Literature and Plans, U. S. Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia, February, 1970.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Frequency Distribution Tables[1]

TABLE 7

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF AGE

Age	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
19-below	17	.69	42	1.00
20-24	386	16.38	1120	27.99
24-29	589	25.02	1318	32.94
30-34	651	27.65	878	21.93
35-39	585	24.85	553	13.87
40-above	124	5.27	89	2.22
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 8

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVITY

County of Nativity	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Northeast	745	31.07	1501	38.89
South	392	16.51	1014	24.61
West	160	6.71	406	10.61
Northwest	220	9.12	293	7.10
Out of State	835	35.49	786	19.24
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

---

[1] Percentage figures for the frequency distribution Tables will not total out to exactly 100% due to truncating of numbers.

TABLE 9

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
USA	2343	99.61	3965	99.12
Other	9	.39	35	.88
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 10

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENCE

County of Residence	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
Northeast	915	38.25	1589	39.51
South	675	28.56	1345	33.54
Northwest	240	10.04	382	9.38
West	229	9.67	470	11.69
Out of State	302	12.83	214	5.35
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MARITAL STATUS

Marital Status	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
Common Law	75	3.18	166	4.15
Divorced	559	23.76	449	11.22
Married	743	31.20	906	22.65
Separated	196	8.33	264	6.60
Single	732	31.12	2154	53.85
Widowed	47	1.99	44	1.10
Other	9	.38	17	.42
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 12

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RELIGION

	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
Religion	f	%	f	%
Protestant	1776	75.50	2745	68.57
Catholic	473	20.11	1121	28.02
Other	103	4.39	134	3.41
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 13

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MILITARY RECORD

Branch	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
Service	f	%	f	%
Army	1229	52.25	0	0.0
Navy	389	16.53		
Air Force	346	14.71		
Marine	248	10.54		
Other	140	5.92		
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RACE

	Veteran		Non-Veteran	
Race	f	%	f	%
Negro	615	26.14	1881	47.02
Caucasian	1533	65.17	1184	29.60
Mexican	204	8.76	935	23.37
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 15

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ORIGINAL EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

OEA	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
Illiterate	49	2.08	684	17.10
1-4	182	7.60	1044	26.34
5-8	1418	60.20	1770	44.12
9-12	664	28.17	359	8.92
Others	39	1.65	143	3.52
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 16

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ORIGINAL INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

IQ Score	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
59-below	22	.89	458	11.38
60-80	382	14.95	1314	32.75
81-100	951	40.75	1194	29.98
101-120	785	33.74	465	11.54
121-above	85	3.59	53	1.31
No Test	127	5.39	516	12.89
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 17

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ORIGINAL COLLEGE HOURS

College Hours	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
None	2333	99.19	3984	99.60
1-30	9	.36	7	.15
31-over	10	.40	9	.20
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 18

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRESENT EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
PEA	f	%	f	%
Illiterate	18	.76	168	4.20
1-4	135	5.66	922	22.98
5-8	1301	55.16	2252	56.21
9-12	882	37.41	641	15.96
Others	16	.67	17	.45
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 19

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRESENT INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

Present	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
IQ Score	f	%	f	%
59-below	22	.89	458	11.38
60-80	358	15.13	1317	32.88
81-100	965	40.95	1220	30.45
101-120	799	31.20	441	12.17
121-above	87	3.68	54	1.33
No Test	121	5.14	463	11.57
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 20

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRESENT COLLEGE HOURS

College	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
Hours	f	%	f	%
None	2332	99.14	3983	99.58
1-30	8	.32	4	.08
31-over	12	.52	13	.26
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 21

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CODEFENDENTS

Number of Codefendents	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	1414	60.11	2124	53.10
One	577	24.53	953	23.82
Two	220	9.35	506	12.65
Three	85	3.61	225	5.62
Four	35	1.48	108	2.70
Five	11	.46	48	1.20
Six-Over	10	.41	36	.88
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 22

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF DETAINERS

Number of Detainers	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2197	93.38	3758	93.94
One	133	5.66	210	5.26
Two-Over	22	.96	32	.80
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 23

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SUSPENDED SENTENCES

Suspended Sentences	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2167	92.14	3754	93.95
One	177	7.52	236	5.90
Two-Over	8	.34	10	.25
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 24

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL PROBATIONS

Federal Probations	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2279	96.89	3915	97.87
One	69	2.93	78	1.95
Two-Over	4	.18	7	.18
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 25

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF STATE PROBATIONS

State Probations	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	1161	49.35	1814	45.34
One	1077	45.97	2048	51.20
Two-Over	114	4.86	138	3.46
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 26

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF DETENTION HOME COMMITMENTS

Number of Commitments	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	1946	82.73	2604	65.10
1-3	327	13.89	788	19.70
4-6	43	1.82	342	8.55
7-9	15	.62	94	2.55
10-Over	21	.85	172	4.21
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 27

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF REFORMATORY CONFINEMENTS

Number of Confinements	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2040	86.74	2590	64.75
One	199	8.46	743	18.57
Two	64	2.75	377	9.42
Three-Over	49	2.05	290	7.27
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 28

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF JAIL CONFINEMENTS

Number of Confinements	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	646	27.46	892	22.30
1-3	946	40.21	1612	40.55
4-6	394	16.73	791	19.77
7-9	132	5.61	242	6.05
10-Over	234	9.99	463	11.33
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 29

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MILITARY CONFINEMENTS

Number of Confinements	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	1642	69.81	0	0.0
One	461	19.60		
Two	180	7.65		
Three-Over	69	2.94		
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 30

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TDC CONFINEMENTS

Number of Confinements	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
Zero	1553	66.02	2408	60.20
One	497	21.13	904	22.60
Two	228	9.69	504	12.60
Three-Over	74	3.16	184	4.60
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 31

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OTHER PRISON CONFINEMENTS

Number of Confinements	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
Zero	1831	77.84	3460	86.50
One	344	14.62	365	9.12
Two	130	5.52	104	2.60
Three-Over	47	1.98	71	1.78
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 32

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF JUVENILE ESCAPES

Number of Escapes	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
Zero	2259	96.04	3562	89.05
One	50	2.12	216	5.40
Two-Over	43	1.84	222	5.55
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 33

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTICN OF OTHER INSTITUTION ESCAPES

Number of Escapes	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2136	90.81	3641	91.02
One	164	6.97	245	6.12
Two-Over	52	2.12	114	1.86
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 34

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TDC ESCAPES

Number of Escapes	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2336	99.33	3989	99.72
One-Over	16	.67	11	.28
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 35

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTICN OF OTHER PRISONS ESCAPES

Number of Escapes	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2294	97.53	3960	99.00
One-Over	58	2.47	40	1.00
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 36

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF JUVENILE ATTEMPTED ESCAPES

Escapes Attempted	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2336	99.32	3923	98.07
One-Over	16	.68	77	.93
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 37

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ATTEMPTED ESCAPES AT O/INSTITUTIONS

Escapes Attempted	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2315	98.43	3915	97.87
One-Over	37	1.47	85	2.13
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 38

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ATTEMPTED ESCAPES-TDC

Escapes Attempted	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2340	99.48	3978	99.45
One-Over	12	.52	22	.55
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 39

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ATTEMPTED ESCAPES AT O/PRISONS

Escapes Attempted	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2338	99.40	3988	99.70
One-Over	14	.60	12	.30
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 40

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLE VIOLATIONS

Number of Violations	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2086	88.68	3466	87.16
One	255	10.86	510	12.24
Two-Over	11	.46	24	.60
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 41

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MINIMUM SENTENCES

Years	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
1-3	1480	63.33	2285	57.11
4-6	739	31.40	1427	35.67
7-9	8	.34	9	.23
10-Over	115	4.85	279	6.94
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 42

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MAXIMUM SENTENCES

Years	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
1-3	483	20.52	274	6.85
4-6	626	26.60	1039	25.97
7-9	218	9.25	393	9.83
10-20	551	23.38	1342	33.52
20-Life	295	12.44	582	14.43
Life	179	7.61	370	9.25
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 43

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF OFFENSES

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
One	1378	58.58	2302	57.55
Two	477	20.28	854	21.35
Three	223	9.48	372	9.30
Four	99	4.20	178	4.45
Five-Over	175	7.32	294	7.35
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 44

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR MURDER

Offenses	Veteran		Non-Veteran	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2128	90.47	3512	87.80
One	213	9.05	470	11.75
Two-Over	11	.48	18	.45
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 45

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR RAPE

Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2244	95.40	3746	93.65
One	95	4.03	228	5.70
Two-Over	13	.57	26	.65
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 46

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR ROBBERY

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	1738	73.89	2834	70.85
One	382	16.24	785	19.62
Two-Over	232	10.03	381	9.51
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 47

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR ASSAULT

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2342	99.57	3983	99.57
One-Over	10	.43	17	.43
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 48

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BURGLARY

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	1684	71.59	2560	64.00
One-Over	668	28.41	1440	36.00
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 49

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THEFT OVER $50

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	1864	79.25	3184	79.60
One-Over	488	20.85	816	20.40
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 50

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR AUTO THEFT

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2331	99.10	3972	99.30
One-Over	21	.90	28	.70
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 51

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR ARSON

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2339	99.44	3985	99.62
One-Over	13	.56	15	.38
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 52

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR FORGERY

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2089	88.81	3736	93.40
One-Over	263	11.19	264	6.60
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 53

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR FRAUD

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2276	96.76	3965	99.12
One-Over	76	3.14	35	.88
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 54

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR STOLEN PROPERTY

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2347	99.78	3995	99.87
One-Over	5	.22	5	.13
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 55

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR WEAPONS OFFENSES

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2332	99.14	3967	99.17
One-Over	20	.86	33	.83
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 56

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR SEX OFFENSES

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2292	97.44	3929	98.22
One-Over	60	2.12	71	1.45
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 57

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR DRUG OFFENSES

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2183	92.81	3654	91.35
One-Over	169	7.19	346	7.65
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 58

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2329	99.02	3991	99.77
One-Over	23	.98	9	.23
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 59

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BREAKING/ENTERING MOTOR VEHICLE

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2336	99.31	3952	98.80
One-Over	16	.69	48	1.20
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 60

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR ESCAPE OFFENSES

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2326	98.89	3952	98.80
One-Over	26	1.11	48	1.20
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 61

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR ASSAULT WITH INTENT TO COMMIT

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2187	92.98	3662	91.55
One-Over	165	7.02	338	8.45
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 62

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR EMBEZZLEMENT

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2341	99.53	3993	99.82
One-Over	11	.47	7	.18
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 63

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR MALICIOUS MISCHIEF

Number of Offenses	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	2345	99.70	3987	99.67
One-Over	7	.30	13	.33
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 64

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR KIDNAPPING

Number of Offenses	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
Zero	2346	99.75	3993	99.83
One-Over	6	.25	7	.17
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 65

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR CONSPIRACY

Number of Offenses	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
Zero	2349	99.88	3996	99.90
One-Over	3	.12	4	.10
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 66

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR TRUSTEE STATUS

Trustee	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
C3	70	2.97	123	3.07
L1	1287	54.71	1793	44.82
L2	3	.12	14	.35
L3	50	2.12	205	5.12
S1	93	3.95	181	4.52
S2	138	5.86	298	7.45
S3	711	30.22	1386	34.65
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 67

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR SEGREGATIVE CLASS*

Segregative Class	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
0	3	.12	9	.22
1	971	41.24	1451	36.24
2	1322	56.16	2436	60.86
3	59	2.50	113	2.81
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

*NOTE: Original and Present Segregative Class were identical.

TABLE 68

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR SECURITY CLASS*

Security Class	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
0-4	12	.50	40	1.00
5-9	2340	99.50	3960	99.00
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

*NOTE: Original and Present Security Class were identical.

TABLE 69

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MEDICAL CLASS

Medical Class	Veterans f	Veterans %	Non-Veterans f	Non-Veterans %
1	1752	74.48	3038	75.94
2	305	12.96	501	12.52
3	204	8.67	310	7.75
4	78	3.31	123	3.07
5	13	.55	28	.70
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

TABLE 70

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR NUMBER OF TIMES IN SOLITARY

Times in Solitary	Veterans		Non-Veterans	
	f	%	f	%
Zero	1840	78.23	2506	62.65
One	347	14.75	862	21.55
Two	95	4.03	365	9.15
Three-Over	70	2.95	267	6.65
TOTALS	2352	100.00	4000	100.00

APPENDIX B

Sample Questionnaire

1. Do you think the combat training you received in the military service made you more physically aggressive?

    (1) Very much (2) Somewhat (3) Not at all

2. Do you believe the strict nature of military discipline influenced you toward improving your personal conduct?

    (1) Very much (2) Somewhat (3) Not at all

3. Did discipline problems you had in the military service make it difficult for you to find work in the civilian occupation you desired?

    (1) Very much (2) Somewhat (3) Not at all

4. Do you feel that your training and experiences in the military service influenced you in anyway to commit the felony for which you were convicted?

    (1) Very much (2) Somewhat (3) Not at all

5. If you had a son, would you encourage him to seek a career in the military service?

    (1) Very much (2) Somewhat (3) Not at all